HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Vol. XII, No. 5 Saturday, January 29, 1955 Washington, D. C.

War Crisis: They did it in the White House between noon and 4 p.m. Friday, January 21. Before noon, Capitol Hill knew that something was coming, an inside conference of a very solemn character, with a big decision in the offing. The "Hill" was alert, apprehensive, nervous.

In the conference room that afternoon were the principals: Admiral Radford, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Secretary of State Dulles; Assistant Secretary for the Far East Robertson; Senator Knowland and Representative Martin, Republican congressional leaders; and the Democratic leaders — Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator George, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (in place of the absent Democratic leader Senator Lyndon Johnson); and — Ike. The President said little, save asking a few questions of a military nature. All recognized the strain under which he labored and were sympathetic. (Those who know him say he is bearing up well, although showing the results of the strain.)

Admiral Radford "made the presentation" — telling of the risk of war, the risk of peace at any price; describing the "lay of the land," the "lay of the islands;" the situation of ourselves and the situation of the Red Chinese. He asked that we defend not only Formosa and the Pescadores close by, but also Quemoy and Matsu, near to the mainland; and finally that we protect the evacuation of Nationalists from the Tachen islands. (Contrary to many reports, the Chiefs of Staff actually have never contemplated the holding of the Tachens, which do not have sufficient military value. For instance, their hilly shores afford no place for airfields.) The Admiral buttressed his argument by citing that the British Admiralty vouched for the soundness of the plan.

Dulles (contrary to some reports) went along completely with Admiral Radford — indeed has not recently disagreed with him. Dulles stressed that in his opinion the move would re-establish U.S. prestige throughout the world.

Then, at last, Ike gave the word — okayed the plan of Radford.

Surprise: Ike's fateful decision came as a great surprise. We have no certain knowledge (nor has any convincing explanation so far appeared in print) why Ike changed between Monday and Friday. For, on Monday, January 17, the President was opposed to the Radford plan. In the following days, he altered his ideas, for some reason not clearly explained. Will he now stick to the military's plan?

This is a very politically-minded town, prone to attribute motives not usually mentioned elsewhere. Political observers wonder if White House aides saw that GOP Leader Knowland's demand for firm action against the Reds enjoyed popular support. They may have learned that the Senator's mail runs well into six figures and that these letters — from all over the country — are about 90 percent approving. Perhaps the White House advisers foresaw that, unless the decision of Friday was satisfactory to the Californian, a congressional blow-off would follow.

President and Congress: Knowland did win the President's consent to ask Congress for sanction to defend the islands. Few in Washington deny that this was a wise move. It contrasts happily with Truman's deportment at the beginning of the Korean War, when the Democratic President took action without obtaining the assent of Congress. Eisenhower's handling of the matter was characterized by respect for constitutional procedure, as Senator Bricker pointed out. Republicans of all shades of opinion joined in expressions of admiration of the President's conduct.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, Ike rejected a suggestion that he make his request personally by a speech to a joint session of both Houses. The President intimated that he preferred not to give the decision "too much emphasis," in the delicate, warlike situation. Some observers believe that he thereby lost a great opportunity to dramatize his stand in the eyes of the world.

Republican Support: In any case, he enjoyed united support of both wings of his party. While none questioned the gravity of the decision and the attendant risks, it is felt that logic dictated this course. For, the Republicans had been foremost in backing MacArthur in his policy of peripheral defense in the West Pacific and his demand that Formosa be classified as a vital link in this defense system (since its fall would bring about the loss of Japan and the Philippines). Herbert Hoover himself endorsed this view. The approaches to Formosa are vital — *ergo*, they must be defended. And, in an overall perspective, what is all this but the Taft-Hoover-MacArthur "sea-air defense system," put forward by the Republicans as against the "mass ground force" strategy formerly backed by Eisenhower himself?

(In a "side-show" to the Big Decision of last week, it is said that Radford and Ridgway — Chief of the Army, who seeks more funds for ground forces — had a little spat, the latter claiming that we have insufficient ground forces for the islands policy. Radford is said to have replied, "We won't need a corporal's guard.")

So, it was inevitable that the Republicans would back this manifestation of the "peripheral" defense plan, of the "sea-air" strategy, a concept developed by its leaders — Taft, Hoover, MacArthur and lately Eisenhower.

Democratic Support: Although the Democrats lined up behind the decision, the press has been discreet in reporting the political overtones in the cloakrooms. Many "across the aisle" feel apprehension that, if successful, the Eisenhower step may spoil Democratic chances for victory in '56. In an off-the-floor private discussion, two Democratic Senators agreed that Ike's recent prestige in the country was low; they expressed fear that his move, if it brought a backdown by Red China, would cause his stock to soar; and that then he would, if he chooses to run, prove invincible in '56. This little *tête-a-tête* explains much of the hemming and hawing of the Democratic members of Congress, and some of the talk about the danger of giving Ike "a blank check."

The Blank Check: As certain observers here see it, the real danger is that Ike may endorse the "blank check" given him by Congress and hand it over to the United Nations. To understand what these observers mean, it is necessary to recognize that one of the profoundest blows inflicted on the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson "world government" concept was Ike's announcement of this "islands" policy. It was, in effect, "we go it alone" and constituted a strictly American move, not a "UN police action," nor in any way involved with global or foreign alliance agreements or consultations. The U.S. acted on its own.

But this blow was keenly felt by the "liberals" and they are now — as may be seen by their mouthpieces in the press — busy trying to restore the UN to command of the situation. No one here can ignore the fact that — despite Eisenhower's decision — the "liberals," who up until now have shaped the President's policy, today want the matter transferred to the UN — with the possibility of another Panmunjom. The "cease-fire" notion may open the gates to all sorts of fancy plans for a UN "mandate" or "international condominium" or UN "trusteeship" for Formosa. The drama — with many acts to follow — has just started.

Post-War Aid to Yugoslavia: Members of Congress are aroused over a news item (January 17, A.P. from Rangoon, Burma) to the effect that Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia was offering arms to the Soviet puppet government of Burma, now at odds with its neighbor, Thailand (independent of Moscow). The latter country is backed by the U.S. and is receiving aid from us. Members of Congress are suspicious that the arms offered to the Red puppet government of Burma are from the store which the U.S. has given Marshal Tito in recent years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They are also viewing Tito's offer to a Red satellite as one more sign that he is double-crossing the free world. At the time we started giving aid to Tito, experienced observers warned that his alleged break with Moscow did not look convincing, and that it was risky to give him economic and military aid. But the "liberal" policy of the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency, which favored aid to socialist regimes, prevailed.

How much assistance have we given Yugoslavia since the end of World War II? Our military aid is classified as top secret, but it is believed to run into many hundreds of millions. Civilian aid reaches the very sizable total of $704,719,000. This is broken down into:

$298,054,000 — UNRRA;
74,000 — post-war Lend-Lease;
15,723,000 — agricultural commodities from private U.S. agencies;
37,560,000 — a special Act of Congress for Yugoslavian aid;
719,000 — the American Red Cross;
296,100,000 — ECA, MSA and FOA;
1,273,000 — Technical Exchange Program;
55,000,000 — loan from American Export-Import Bank on which, as of June 30, 1954, no payments had been made;
216,000 — prior grants from U.S. government agencies converted into credit arrangements and still outstanding.

Thus, total aid to Yugoslavia, in post-war years, is $704,719,000.

FOA's Propaganda Line on Capitol Hill this year was revealed in the *New York Times* of January 3. The Foreign Operations Administration is disseminating data to show the extent to which the economy of the U.S.A. has benefited from and become dependent on foreign aid. This alarming "line" is being used to corral votes in the Congress for continued large foreign aid and perpetuation of the FOA under that or some other name. Three-fourths of foreign aid money is spent for American goods and services: farm products, manufactures, ocean freight, etc. FOA asserts that 25 percent of our exports in 1954 were financed by "foreign aid;" i.e., were given away.

Thus, the propaganda tack is to appeal to farmers to support foreign aid because FOA will pay them for their products; and similarly appeal to industry, organized labor, shipping interests and others. The fallacy lies in this: when goods are produced to be given away, the payrolls that paid for their production remain behind without anything new to buy for the money. This is straight inflation. Many economists argue that the answer to inflation is more production; but they mean production of things to be sold at home. Not only is large and continuous foreign aid inflationary; it scatters our real wealth — the metals and oils from our resources — and even "mines" the soil of our farms. These are indeed "unrequited exports."

FOA's propaganda is not its own invention. The same appeals were made to "sell" the country on the Marshall Plan, the first post-war British loan, Bretton Woods and other programs. Back in the New Deal days the Committee for the Nation, leading the propaganda for devaluation of the dollar, made similar appeals. Silver Senators, working for a silver purchasing program "to raise the purchasing power of half the world" — as they speciously argued — stood on the Senate floor and appealed one by one to the cotton and wheat farmers, the industries and the workers to support the give-away measures of that day.

The propaganda was effective then. It will take its toll again. Today FOA's arguments are too pleasant to be argued about in some circles. Thus the *CIO News* wails: "CIO Airs Concern over Talk of Economic Aid, Point 4 Cuts."

The Welfare State: An old adage declares that two people can't profit by taking in each other's washing. But under a Welfare State it evidently no longer holds water.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In England two housewives were officially hauled in recently for agreeing to take in each other's washing so as to qualify for jobless insurance benefits. To obtain these benefits, a party must show that he, or she, had been employed. So, one of these enterprising housewives hired the other and vice versa, in accordance with the terms of this extraordinary laundry deal. Then, each as an employer stamped the other's national insurance card signifying that they were working. After a few washings, each fired the other, and both collected jobless insurance for the next six months. Then they rehired each other and started a new cycle of benefits.

One of the basic flaws in the Welfare State is that it breeds dishonesty and graft — becomes, in fact, honeycombed with it.

Education Front: We have received the following letter: "I am a student at Queens College of the City of New York and a member of the Young Republican Club at that College. I'm writing to inform you of an event which you might term a 'sign of the times.' We had never agreed on a name for our Republican Club. It had, for quite a few years, been called merely 'The Young Republican Club.' One week after the November election we agreed upon a name — The Robert A. Taft Young Republican Club. This was unanimously accepted.

"One member facetiously suggested that we burn Dewey in effigy. I think this is indicative of the fairly general disgust with the watered-down New Dealers who call themselves Republican but are indistinguishable from Democrats."

Fabian Socialism: We note the appearance of a "Committee for the Exposure of Fabian Socialism," 255 West 108th Street, New York, 25, N. Y. The organization is interested in the study of Fabianism in the political life of Britain (referring to Sister M. Margaret Patricia McCarran's book on that subject), the influence of socialists on American education and related subjects. The group also seeks to attract attention to the report of the Reece Committee, Special House Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations (see HUMAN EVENTS issue dated December 22, 1954). This new Committee was organized as a non-profit undertaking and its Chairman is C. M. Bertolette, recently associated with staff investigations on Capitol Hill. Others on its letterhead are H. C. Furstenwalde, Editor of *Independence Magazine,* John T. Balfe and Leopold Braun, A.A. (the priest who for many years served as chaplain of the American Catholics in Moscow.)

Repeal the 16th Amendment? Resolutions backed by leading taxpayers' associations are being introduced in state legislatures urging repeal of the 16th Amendment — permitting federal income and inheritance taxes.

If the 16th Amendment should be repealed, the continuing concentration of power in the federal government would be reversed. States, municipalities and the school districts would be able to get ample funds for schools and all other legitimate public purposes. The never-ending parade to Washington of state and local officials pleading for federal aid would cease.

The arguments in favor of this reform are brilliantly marshalled by Frank Chodorov in his book *Income Tax: The Root of all Evil.* HUMAN EVENTS has the book in stock. Send a copy to every member of your state legislature and other opinion-molding personages. We'll mail the books direct — postpaid — to legislators and others if you will supply names and addresses. Act quickly if your legislature is in session. $2 each — postpaid. $1.60 each, postpaid, if 25 or more are ordered.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $6. One year, $10. First class mail, one year, $11.50, six months, $6.75. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year $13; foreign (regular mail) one year, $12. Foreign airmail, $18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. *Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.* Bound annual volume with index, $15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 5 HUMAN EVENTS January 29, 1955

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

By FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

SOME YEARS BACK a distinguished Southern jurist, Judge John J. Parker, of North Carolina, was named to a Supreme Court vacancy. The Senate rejected Judge Parker's nomination. The principal charge against him was that he had upheld a so-called "Yellow Dog" contract under which a worker, in order to get and hold a job, had to agree not to join a union.

During the lively Senate debate, members of the liberal group talked movingly and effectively about human rights and the freedom of the individual. When the Wagner Act was approved during the Roosevelt Administration, the "Yellow Dog" contract was banned. An employer no longer might make non-union membership a condition of employment. The ban on such a contract was continued by the Taft-Hartley Act.

The question at once rises: if it is fitting and proper — as I think it is — to prevent an employer from compelling his employees to stay out of a union, why isn't it fitting and proper also to outlaw union membership as a condition of employment? Isn't it logical to assume that a man should have the right either to join or stay out of a labor union? All the arguments which caused the Congress to outlaw the employer's "Yellow Dog" contract weigh just as heavily in the case of the union's "Yellow Dog" contract — the contract which forces a man to belong to a union in order to earn his living. Yet, today, well over 60 percent of the collective bargaining contracts signed have a union shop provision. And the union leaders are planning eventually to prohibit any legislation, state or federal, which would prevent the union shop, or any other form of compulsory unionism.

Many persons think there is an essential difference between the closed shop and the union shop collective bargaining agreement. They feel that the closed shop, under which a worker has to be a member of the union in order to get a job, is what we mean by compulsory unionism. They feel that it is immoral and should be prohibited, as actually it is under the Taft-Hartley Act.

But there is little difference between the closed shop and the union shop. The union shop requires that a worker, in order to hold a job, must join the union within a certain stipulated period. In either instance, the employee is forced to become a union member and to pay dues if he wants to hold his job.

IT IS TIME that the controversy over compulsory unionism be examined and discussed in terms of the fundamental issues. Let us lay aside for a moment the rights of the individual worker and the affront to his liberties from having to join a union. Let us look at the motives of those who seek to extend the union shop and other forms of compulsion. The aims of the union officials are plain. They want membership in a union as a condition of employment in all jobs. They want a union monopoly on jobs. They want complete union control over the working force of the nation. Their spokesmen have said so in arguments before the Supreme Court.

The rise of big unions — the CIO, AFL and United Mine Workers — has paralleled the concentration of power in comparatively few hands in other sections of our economy. With the rise of the big unions has come a corresponding

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rise in the power of union leaders. All of us have witnessed in recent years the impotence of government and the public before determined labor bosses. Time and time again, paralysis has threatened the country as the coal miners, or steel workers, or railroad workers awaited the word from their leaders to go out on strike.

If we extend compulsory unionism to all industries, what we have actually done is to give union leaders control over all workers. With that control will go control over all industry and control over government, too.

The stake then in this fight over compulsory unionism is control over the United States. Or to put it another way, the triumph of compulsory unionism means labor fascism. Perhaps it would be a benevolent kind of fascism, but it would be fascism and a mockery to the democracy which, despite its faults, has made us a great nation; a nation in which it is a privilege to live.

The unions today are making a determined drive against the so-called state right-to-work laws. There are 17 states with laws which ban, or are intended to ban, compulsory unionism. The unions think no more such laws should be enacted and that the ones already in existence should be wiped out.

This is not to say that the men trying to extend compulsory unionism are aiming at a labor dictatorship. Many of them are sincere and well-intentioned men who have the interests of the working man at heart. Still, power put into the hands of good men for one purpose often is used by bad men for quite another purpose. If the years have taught us anything, it is that dictatorial power is a man-eating monster. Let us compare the promises of Hitler, Lenin, Stalin and Mussolini with what actually happened to the unfortunate people over whom they had control. We cannot afford to give too much authority to any group of men whether they represent industry or labor.

WHAT IS THE excuse of the men who support and want to extend compulsory unionism? There are a number of arguments but the principal one is that since unions are good for the workers, everyone should be compelled to join unions. Or to put it another way, why should some workers have to carry the burden of union membership for the benefit of all? Why shouldn't all be compelled to pay their fair share toward the benefits all get? Why should "free riders" be allowed?

On the surface this type of argument is persuasive, but it will not bear examination. It is the argument which dictators use as an excuse for the suppression of all open opposition. Hitler contended that National Socialism was good for all Germany. Why then should the nation permit opposition which might undo the good he and National Socialism were doing? The excuse for the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia is that this dictatorship was necessary — for a time — to consolidate the great gains made by Communism and to prevent the return of the exploiters.

Only, such a dictatorship never ceases, for there always is some new reason advanced for its continuation.

I am sorry to say, also, that some so-called liberal newspapers are supporting compulsory unionism.

WHAT ABOUT the individual rights and civil liberties of the worker who is compelled to join a union against his will? Or do individual rights and civil liberties belong only to those who are accused of subversion? Some newspapers seem to think so.

As I see it, there isn't too much substance to the other union arguments in favor of compulsory unionism. They charge that those who oppose compulsion are opposed to unions. I am afraid that this charge is used often by union spokesmen to belabor anyone who opposes them. The union leaders charged that the Taft-Hartley Act was a slave labor act because it limited the power of the union leaders. The public did not support the charge, nor did the facts warrant it. Gradually, one hears less and less about the "slave labor" act. Now, the unions have come around to discussing certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provisions of the law which they believe should be modified. This is quite different from the roar of indignation and the threats which followed passage of the Act.

The contention that a union shop is necessary to protect the unions is absurd in view of the size and strength of the unions. In 1932, union membership was around 3,226,000; today it is over 17 million and still is rising.

The unions argue that federal law should predominate in the labor field. If the Taft-Hartley Act permits the union shop, as it does, they say that no state should be allowed to ban it. The Taft-Hartley Act expressly permits the states to enact laws banning compulsory unionism. If this permission is repealed, the state right-to-work laws automatically would be wiped out.

It has been my experience that contending forces in our national economy argue states rights if the trend in the states favors their particular cause. I do not want to sound cynical in saying this. Actually, the trend towards federal concentration of power is distressing and alarming. Still we must not forget that at one time, the advocates of slavery relied upon federal approval. The opponents of slavery relied upon state legislation which sets the slaves in that state free or laws which prevented the return of escapees to their masters.

There was once a time when a majority of the employees had to approve the union shop before it could go into effect. This is no longer true, however. Union leaders may now bargain for a union shop and sign such a contract, regardless of the wishes of their members. Moreover, the authority which union leaders have over the rank and file is well known. The safeguards around union balloting are inadequate.

In many instances, union officials know how every vote is cast in a union election. Where safeguards exist, oftentimes they are not properly enforced. It frequently is worth a man's job and in some instances his physical well-being to oppose the wishes of the union hierarchy.

The union spokesmen also say that a workman cannot be fired for refusal to join a union shop if he pays his dues. The payment of dues is, of course, the crux of the whole case. If a worker is willing to pay dues to the union, to pay a tax to a private organization for the privilege of working, why should he not be willing to go all the way and join the union? Furthermore, opposition to the union shop is dangerous even if the worker is willing to pay his dues in order to earn his living. If a union shop is in effect, a worker risks a lot if he opposes his union superiors. Theoretically, he can continue to hold his job if he pays his dues. Actually, his livelihood is in danger if he stands out against the union officials for whatever reason. Some union constitutions give officials power to expel recalcitrants for almost any cause. Few workers can remain indefinitely in a union if the bosses want them out. An employer who signs a union shop contract, generally speaking, wants to get along with the union even if that means discharging workers who oppose the union leaders.

It should not have to be pointed out that compulsory unionism makes it easier for union officials to perpetuate themselves in office. The custom is for the higher union officials to keep their jobs year in and year out. It is news when there is a successful revolt. Compulsory unionism makes understandings between unscrupulous employers and venal union officials easier. It adds impetus to the growing alliances between some union leaders, the underworld and corrupt politicians. Not long ago, a wage contract between the International Longshoremen's Association and shipowners in New York included the union shop. An official body of the state of New York held that this union was gangster-dominated. It would be a bold worker indeed who would speak out and say he didn't like the union shop for this outfit.

One of the surprising facts about this entire controversy is the extent of worker opposition to the union shop. The union leaders speak of it as union security but the workers instinctively know that it is security for the officials. It is a kind of prison for the men, a prison in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which their rights and their freedom of speech are taken away.

There is ample evidence that many thoughtful union workmen resent and fear the authority which their superiors have over them. In 1950, the bosses of the big unions used all their energy and resources in the attempt to defeat Senator Taft. They failed because the workingmen would not heed them. The results of many recent national and state elections can be explained only on the theory that the union workingmen listened to the advice of their union bosses — and then voted the other way.

In 1951, the Congress approved a measure which authorized the union shop for the railroads. Since that time, most railroads have signed a union shop contract, despite stubborn opposition by thousands of the workers. Newspaper reports were to the effect that over 400 workers were fired on the New York Central alone because they opposed compulsion.

MANY EMPLOYERS apparently welcome the union shop. It makes dealing with the union easier. These employers do not consider the immediate effect upon their men who wish to remain free, nor the long-time consequences. It is time that these employers began to consider their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy. It is time that Congress took another look at compulsory unionism. It is time that the public woke up to what is going on.

For fascism is fascism, whether from the right or left. We cannot have one rule for the unions and another rule for the rest of us unless we want a labor dictatorship.

We need to get down to fundamentals about this matter. In one way or another, we must outlaw compulsory unionism.

Fred A. Hartley, Jr., former Republican Congressman from New Jersey, is co-author of the Taft-Hartley Act.

THE NATIONAL RIGHT-TO-WORK COMMITTEE has been formed by (1) union members who oppose the union shop; (2) former members of unions who have been expelled because of their opposition to compulsion; (3) business and professional men who feel that compulsory labor union membership is a serious threat to American democracy.

Chairman of the Board of Directors is Edward S. Dillard, President of the Old Dominion Box Company of Charlotte, North Carolina. The President is Fred A. Hartley, Jr., former Republican member of Congress from New Jersey and co-author of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Other members of the Board are:

W. T. Harrison of Louisville, Kentucky, a former official of the Railway Clerks Union who was expelled from his union for writing letters to Congress opposing amendments to the Railway Labor Act to permit the signing of union-shop contracts.

Mrs. Amy Cook Rogers of Miami, Florida, a former employee of Pan-American Airways, who was discharged because of her refusal to join a union under a union-shop contract despite a long legal fight and the expenditure of her own personal savings to retain her job.

John H. Wynn of Fort Thomas, Kentucky, a conductor on the C. & O. Railroad and for 42 years a railway employee and most of that time a member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors. Mr. Wynn says he speaks for thousands of fellow Brotherhood members who oppose forced membership.

Additional Copies of Section II (the article section): 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article (of which this section is an example). $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED